

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES  
LIBRARY

COPY NO.

IMM-NYU 236  
SEPTEMBER 1956

25 Waverly Place, New York 3, N. Y.



NEW YORK UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF  
MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

IMM 236

## A Fixed Point Theorem

WALTER T. KYNER

---

PREPARED UNDER  
CONTRACT NO. DA-30-069-ORD-1258  
WITH THE  
OFFICE OF ORDNANCE RESEARCH  
UNITED STATES ARMY

REPRODUCTION IN WHOLE OR IN PART  
IS PERMITTED BY THE SECRETARY  
OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

IMM-236  
C.1



A FIXED POINT THEOREM

Walter T. Kyner

This report represents results obtained at the Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, under the sponsorship of Contract No. DA-30-069-ORD-1258 with the United States Army, Office of Ordnance Research.

New York, 1956



# A FIXED POINT THEOREM

## Section 1

The purpose of this paper is to prove a fixed point theorem that is useful in the Diliberto perturbation theory. The (non-degenerate) perturbation theorems of G. Hufford [1] and M. Marcus [2] are implied by this result.

I wish to thank Professor S. P. Diliberto for suggesting this problem and for his continued interest in it. In addition, I wish to thank Professor L. Nirenberg for pointing out a mistake in an earlier "proof" of this theorem.

We are interested in a family of transformations defined on a subset of the space of real multiply periodic continuously differentiable  $m$ -dimensional vector valued functions of  $s$  real variables. If  $f = (f_1, \dots, f_m)$  is such a function, then  $f(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s)$  must be periodic with period  $\omega_k$  in  $\theta_k$ .

We use

$$\|f\| = \max \left[ \|f\|_0, \left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta_k} \right\|_0 \right],$$

where

$$\|f\|_0 = \max_i \max_{\theta} |f_i(\theta)|.$$

For a fixed real number  $\gamma$ , the transformation  $g = T_\gamma(f)$  is given by

$$(1) \quad g(\bar{\theta}) = N(\theta)f(\theta) + W(f(\theta), \theta, \gamma)$$

where  $\theta$  is a function of  $\bar{\theta}$ ,  $f$ , and  $\gamma$  defined implicitly by

$$(2) \quad \bar{\theta} = V_{f\gamma}(\theta) = \theta + \pi + U(f(\theta), \theta, \gamma).$$

$\pi$  is a constant  $s$ -vector.  $N(\theta)$  is an  $m \times m$  matrix whose entries  $C^2$  functions of  $\theta$ .  $U(y, \theta, \gamma)$  and  $W(y, \theta, \gamma)$  are vector valued functions of  $m+s+1$  real variables whose second partial derivatives with respect to  $y$  and  $\theta$  are continuous in  $y$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $\gamma$ .  $U$ ,  $W$ , and  $N$  are periodic in  $\theta$ . We also require that



$$W(0, \theta, 0) \equiv 0 ,$$

$$U(0, \theta, 0) \equiv 0 ,$$

and

$$\frac{\partial W(0, \theta, 0)}{\partial y} \equiv 0 .$$

The transformations used by Marcus and Hufford are of this form.

To insure that equation (2) can be solved for  $\theta$ , we restrict  $\gamma$  and  $\|f\|$  so that

$$\left( \frac{\partial \bar{\theta}_i}{\partial \theta_j} \right)$$

is non-singular.

For each  $\gamma$  sufficiently small, we hope to find a function that is invariant under  $T_\gamma$ . It is necessary to make an additional restriction on the transformations considered. Hufford (for  $s = 1$ ) assumed that all but one of the characteristic exponents of a variational equation had non-zero real parts. This hypothesis determines the form of  $N(\theta)$ . For his many variable result, Marcus assumed that the norm of  $N(\theta)$  was less than one. Marcus' theorem does not imply Hufford's. It will be shown below that their hypotheses imply the following:

(H): For each  $f$  and  $\gamma$  such that  $\|f\| \leq r_0$ ,  $|\gamma| \leq \gamma_0$ , define the linear transformation  $L_{f\gamma}$  by

$$(3) \quad [L_{f\gamma}g](\theta) = g(V_{f\gamma}(\theta)) - N(\theta)g(\theta) .$$

We assume that  $L_{f\gamma}$  is invertible and that its inverse is uniformly bounded, i.e.,  $\|L_{f\gamma}^{-1}\| \leq A$  for all  $\|f\| \leq r_0$ ,  $|\gamma| \leq r_0$ .

## Section 2

THEOREM. If  $T_\gamma$  is defined as above, and if the hypotheses (H) is satisfied, then there exists  $\gamma_0$  such that if  $|\gamma| \leq \gamma_0$ ,  $T_\gamma$  has a unique fixed point  $f_\gamma$ .  $f_\gamma$  is continuous in  $\gamma$ , and as  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ ,  $f_\gamma \rightarrow 0$ . Furthermore

1. 2.

$$\left\{ \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta_k} \right\}$$

satisfy a uniform Lipschitz condition.

PROOF. If  $f$  is invariant under  $T_\gamma$ , then

$$(4) \quad f(V_{f\gamma}) = N(\theta)f(\theta) + W(f(\theta), \theta, \gamma) .$$

Therefore

$$(5) \quad f = L_{f\gamma}^{-1} W(f, \gamma)$$

where

$$[W(f, \gamma)](\theta) = W(f(\theta), \theta, \gamma) .$$

It is sufficient to show that  $L^{-1}W$  has a fixed point. This will be done by restricting its domain to a compact convex set. If this set and  $\gamma_0$  are properly selected, then  $L^{-1}W$  is continuous on this set and maps it into itself. By Schauder's theorem,  $L^{-1}W$  has a fixed point. Uniqueness and continuity in  $\gamma$  follow from a separate computation.

Let

$$C(r, u) = \left\{ g \in C^2 \mid \|g\| \leq r, \left\| \frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_k} \right\| \leq u, k=1, \dots, s \right\} .$$

The proof depends on the careful selection of the numbers  $r$ ,  $u$ , and  $\gamma$ . To emphasize this a separate numbering system will be used.

(o) We pick  $r_0, \gamma_0$  so that if  $|r| \leq r_0, |\gamma| \leq \gamma_0$ , then  $T_\gamma$  is well defined and  $L_{f\gamma}^{-1}$  is uniformly bounded by  $A$ .

If  $f$  is in  $C(r, u)$  and  $g = L_{f\gamma}^{-1} W(f, \gamma)$ , then  $\|g\| \leq A \|W(f, \gamma)\|$ . We want  $\|g\| \leq r$ .

If we expand  $W(f(\theta), \theta, \gamma)$ , we get

$$(6) \quad \|W(f, \gamma)\| \leq \|W(0, \gamma)\| + \left\| \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} \right\| \cdot \|f\| .$$



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

100 N. LAUREL STREET, CHICAGO, ILL. 60607

U.S. POSTAGE PERMIT NO. 1000 CHICAGO, ILL.

ISSN 0000-0000

VOLUME 1, NUMBER 1, 1968

1968

Copyright © 1968 by The University of Chicago Press

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the University of Chicago Press.

This journal is indexed/abstracted in the following publications: JSTOR, Social Sciences Citation Index, Social Sciences Index, Social Sciences and Humanities Citation Index, Social Sciences and Humanities Index, Current Contents/Social and Behavioral Sciences, Current Index in Journals in Education, Current Contents/Social and Behavioral Sciences, Current Index in Journals in Education, Current Contents/Social and Behavioral Sciences, Current Index in Journals in Education.

Subscription prices: Single copies: \$10.00; Annual subscription: \$30.00 (U.S. and possessions); \$35.00 (Canada, Mexico, and foreign countries); \$40.00 (Europe, Japan, and other countries).

Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in U.S.A. and possessions to The University of Chicago Press, 100 N. Laurel Street, Chicago, Ill. 60607. Send address changes in other countries to The University of Chicago Press, Journals Department, 100 Brookfield Drive, West Nyack, N.Y. 10994.

Printed in the U.S.A.

Printed on acid-free paper.

MADE IN U.S.A.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
100 N. LAUREL STREET, CHICAGO, ILL. 60607  
U.S. POSTAGE PERMIT NO. 1000 CHICAGO, ILL.

Subscription prices: Single copies: \$10.00; Annual subscription: \$30.00 (U.S. and possessions); \$35.00 (Canada, Mexico, and foreign countries); \$40.00 (Europe, Japan, and other countries).

This journal is indexed/abstracted in the following publications: JSTOR, Social Sciences Citation Index, Social Sciences Index, Social Sciences and Humanities Citation Index, Social Sciences and Humanities Index, Current Contents/Social and Behavioral Sciences, Current Index in Journals in Education, Current Contents/Social and Behavioral Sciences, Current Index in Journals in Education, Current Contents/Social and Behavioral Sciences, Current Index in Journals in Education.

Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in U.S.A. and possessions to The University of Chicago Press, 100 N. Laurel Street, Chicago, Ill. 60607. Send address changes in other countries to The University of Chicago Press, Journals Department, 100 Brookfield Drive, West Nyack, N.Y. 10994.

Printed in the U.S.A.

Printed on acid-free paper.

MADE IN U.S.A.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

100 N. LAUREL STREET, CHICAGO, ILL. 60607

U.S. POSTAGE PERMIT NO. 1000 CHICAGO, ILL.

ISSN 0000-0000

VOLUME 1, NUMBER 1, 1968

1968

To control the size of  $\left\| \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} \right\|$ , it is sufficient to limit  $\left\| \frac{W_1}{y_j} \right\|$ .

$$(7) \quad \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \left( \frac{\partial W_1}{\partial y_j} \right) \right\|_0 \leq \sum_{n=1}^m \left\| \frac{\partial^2 W_1}{\partial y_n \partial y_j} \right\|_0 r + \left\| \frac{\partial^2 W_1}{\partial \theta_k \partial y_j} \right\|_0.$$

(i) Since  $\frac{\partial^2 W_1}{\partial y_n \partial y_j}$  is uniformly bounded, and since  $\frac{\partial W(0, \theta, 0)}{\partial y} = 0$ , we can pick  $r_1 \leq r_0$  and  $\gamma_1 \leq \gamma_0$ , so that  $A \left\| \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .

(ii) We then pick  $\gamma_2 \leq \gamma_1$ , so that  $A \|W(0, \gamma)\| \leq (\frac{1}{2})r_1$ , if  $|\gamma| \leq \gamma_2$ . As we further restrict the size of  $r$ , it will be necessary to select  $\gamma$  so that (ii) is still satisfied.

We now have that if  $f$  is in  $C(r_1, u)$  and  $|\gamma| \leq \gamma_2$ , then  $\|L_{f\gamma}^{-1} W(f, \gamma)\| \leq r_1$ . If  $g = L_{f\gamma}^{-1} W(f, \gamma)$ , then  $L_{f\gamma} g = W(f, \gamma)$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial \theta_k} - \frac{\partial N(\theta)}{\partial \theta_k} g(\theta) - N(\theta) \frac{\partial g(\theta)}{\partial \theta_k} \\ = \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{\partial W}{\partial y_n} \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial \theta_k} + \frac{\partial W}{\partial \theta_k}. \end{aligned}$$

To obtain a bound on  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_k}$ , we form a product space and consider elements  $\bar{h} = (h^1, \dots, h^s)$ . For fixed  $f$  and  $\gamma$ , a linear transformation  $\bar{M}_{f\gamma}$  is defined on this space by

$$(9) \quad \left[ \bar{M}_{f\gamma} \bar{h} \right]^k(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^s h^i(V_{f\gamma}) \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial \theta_k} - N(\theta) h^k(\theta).$$

Defining  $\bar{L}_{f\gamma}$  by  $[\bar{L}_{f\gamma}] = (\delta_{ik} L_{f\gamma})$ , we see that

$$(10) \quad \left[ (\bar{M}_{f\gamma} - \bar{L}_{f\gamma}) \bar{h} \right]^k(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^s h^i(V_{f\gamma}) \left[ \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial y_n} \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial \theta_k} + \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial \theta_k} \right],$$

$k = 1, \dots, s$ .

# Bayesian Inference for the Generalized Linear Model

David A. Blei, John D. Lafferty, and Michael I. Jordan

Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

blei@stat.berkeley.edu

Abstract: We present a new approach to Bayesian inference for the generalized linear model (GLM). The approach is based on a new representation of the GLM as a hierarchical model.

Keywords: Bayesian inference, generalized linear model, hierarchical model

1. Introduction. The generalized linear model (GLM) is a widely used statistical model for regression analysis. It is a generalization of the linear model, which allows for non-normal distributions of the response variable.

2. The GLM as a hierarchical model. The GLM can be viewed as a hierarchical model. The response variable  $y$  is generated from a distribution that depends on a linear combination of the predictors  $x$  and the parameters  $\beta$ .

3. Bayesian inference for the GLM. Bayesian inference for the GLM involves estimating the posterior distribution of the parameters  $\beta$  given the observed data  $y$  and  $x$ .

4. The new approach. The new approach to Bayesian inference for the GLM is based on a new representation of the GLM as a hierarchical model. This representation allows for a more efficient and accurate estimation of the posterior distribution of the parameters  $\beta$ .

5. Simulation results. We present simulation results that compare the new approach to other methods of Bayesian inference for the GLM. The results show that the new approach is more accurate and efficient than the other methods.

6. Conclusion. The new approach to Bayesian inference for the GLM is a significant improvement over existing methods. It provides a more accurate and efficient way to estimate the posterior distribution of the parameters  $\beta$ .

7. Acknowledgments. We thank the National Science Foundation for their support of this research.

8. References. Blei, D. A., Lafferty, J. D., and Jordan, M. I. (2005). Bayesian inference for the generalized linear model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(471), 1001-1012.

9. Appendix. The appendix contains the proofs of the theorems presented in the paper.

10. Author's address. David A. Blei, John D. Lafferty, and Michael I. Jordan, Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-1380.

11. Author's e-mail address. blei@stat.berkeley.edu

12. Author's phone number. (415) 854-2800

13. Author's fax number. (415) 854-2800

14. Author's web page. <http://www.stat.berkeley.edu/~blei/>

15. Author's mailing address. David A. Blei, John D. Lafferty, and Michael I. Jordan, Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-1380.

16. Author's e-mail address. blei@stat.berkeley.edu

17. Author's phone number. (415) 854-2800

18. Author's fax number. (415) 854-2800

$L_{f\gamma}$  invertible implies that  $\bar{L}_{f\gamma}$  is invertible. To invert  $\bar{M}_{f\gamma}$ , we must make  $\|\bar{M}_{f\gamma} - \bar{L}_{f\gamma}\|$  sufficiently small. To do this, we see that

$$(11) \quad \left\| \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial y_n} \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial \theta_k} + \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial \theta_k} \right\|_0 \leq \sum_{n=1}^m \left\| \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial y_n} \right\|_0 r + \left\| \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial \theta_k} \right\|_0 .$$

$$(12) \quad \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_t} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial y_n} \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial \theta_k} + \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial \theta_k} \right] \right\|_0 \leq \sum_{n=1}^m \left[ \sum_{j=1}^m \left\| \frac{\partial^2 U_i}{\partial y_n \partial y_j} \right\|_0 r^2 \right. \\ \left. + \left\| \frac{\partial^2 U_i}{\partial \theta_t \partial y_n} \right\|_0 r + \left\| \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial y_n} \right\|_0 u \right] + \left\| \frac{\partial^2 U_i}{\partial \theta_t \partial \theta_k} \right\|_0 ,$$

$$(13) \quad \|h(V_{f\gamma})\|_0 = \|h\|_0 ,$$

and

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} h(V_{f\gamma}) \right\|_0 \leq \|h\|_0 \left[ 1 + \sum_{n=1}^m \left\| \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial y_n} \right\|_0 r + \left\| \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial \theta_k} \right\|_0 \right] .$$

$U(0, \theta, 0) = 0$ , and  $\frac{\partial U}{\partial y_n}$ ,  $\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial y_n \partial y_j}$  are uniformly bounded.

(iii) We can pick  $r_2 \leq r_1$ ,  $\gamma_3 \leq \gamma_2$ , and  $u_1$ , so that if  $f$  is in  $C(r_2, u_1)$  and  $|\gamma| \leq \gamma_3$ , then

$\bar{M}_{f\gamma}$  is invertible and  $\|\bar{M}_{f\gamma}^{-1}\| \leq B$ .

We now have (from equation (8))

$$(14) \quad \frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_k} = \bar{M}_{f\gamma}^{-1} \left[ \frac{\partial N}{\partial \theta_k} g + \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta_k} + \frac{\partial W}{\partial \theta_k} \right] .$$

Therefore

$$(15) \quad \left\| \frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_k} \right\| \leq B \left[ \left\| \frac{\partial N}{\partial \theta_k} \right\| \|g\| + \left\| \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} \right\| \left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta_k} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\partial W}{\partial \theta_k} \right\| \right] .$$

(iv) We pick  $r_3 \leq r_2$ ,  $\gamma_4 \leq \gamma_3$ , so that  $B \left\| \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} \right\| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$ , and so that

... ..  
... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

$$B \left[ \left\| \frac{\partial N}{\partial \theta_k} \right\| r_3 + \left\| \frac{\partial W}{\partial \theta_k} \right\| \right] \leq \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) u_1 .$$

It follows that if  $f$  is in  $C(r_3, u_1)$ , and if  $|\gamma| \leq \gamma_4$ , then

$$(16) \quad B \left[ \left\| \frac{\partial N}{\partial \theta_k} \right\| r_3 + \left\| \frac{\partial W}{\partial \theta_k} \right\| \right] \leq \left[ 1 - B \left\| \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} \right\| \right] u_1 .$$

This implies that  $\left\| \frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_k} \right\| \leq u_1$  .

We have selected a conditionally compact set that is mapped into itself by  $L^{-1}W$ . We will now show that  $L^{-1}W$  also maps  $\bar{C}$ , the closure of  $C(r_3, u_1)$ , into itself and is continuous on  $\bar{C}$ .

If  $f_n$  is in  $C(r_3, u_1)$ , and if  $\lim f_n = f_0$ , then we can assume that  $\lim g_n = g_0$ , where  $g_n$  is the image of  $f_n$ .  $f_0$  and  $g_0$  are in  $\bar{C}$ . Let  $L_n = L_{f_n \gamma}$ , and  $V_n = V_{f_n \gamma}$ . Since  $L_n g_n = W(f_n, \gamma)$ , we have

$$(17) \quad g_n(V_n(\theta)) = W(f_n(\theta), \theta, \gamma) + N(\theta)g_n(\theta).$$

The limit of the right hand side of the equation defines a function  $g^*$  .

$$(18) \quad |g^*(\theta) - g_0(V_0(\theta))| \leq |g^*(\theta) - g_n(V_n(\theta))| \\ + |g_n(V_0(\theta)) - g_0(V_0(\theta))| + |g_n(V_n(\theta)) - g_n(V_0(\theta))| .$$

Since  $g_n$  is in  $C(r_3, u_1)$  (and therefore in  $\bar{C}$ ),

$$(19) \quad |g_n(V_n(\theta)) - g_n(V_0(\theta))| \leq sr_3 \|U(f_n, \gamma) - U(f_0, \gamma)\|_0 .$$

By taking  $n$  large, we see that  $\|g^* - g_0(V_0)\|_0 = 0$ . Therefore  $g^* = g_0(V_0)$ , and  $g_0 = L_0^{-1}W(f_0, \gamma)$ . We have shown that  $\bar{C}$  is mapped into itself. If we duplicate the argument, taking  $f_n$  in  $\bar{C}$ , we see that  $L^{-1}W$  is continuous.

For fixed  $\gamma$ ,  $L^{-1}W$  is a continuous map of a compact convex set into itself. By Schauder's theorem, there is at least one

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Find  $A+B$ ,  $A-B$ ,  $AB$ , and  $BA$ .

$$A+B = \begin{bmatrix} 1+4 & 2+3 \\ 3+2 & 4+1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 5 \\ 5 & 5 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A-B = \begin{bmatrix} 1-4 & 2-3 \\ 3-2 & 4-1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -3 & -1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$AB = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1(4) + 2(2) & 1(3) + 2(1) \\ 3(4) + 4(2) & 3(3) + 4(1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 8 & 5 \\ 20 & 13 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$BA = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 4(1) + 3(3) & 4(2) + 3(4) \\ 2(1) + 1(3) & 2(2) + 1(4) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 13 & 20 \\ 5 & 8 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A+B = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 5 \\ 5 & 5 \end{bmatrix}, A-B = \begin{bmatrix} -3 & -1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$AB = \begin{bmatrix} 8 & 5 \\ 20 & 13 \end{bmatrix}, BA = \begin{bmatrix} 13 & 20 \\ 5 & 8 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A+B = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 5 \\ 5 & 5 \end{bmatrix}, A-B = \begin{bmatrix} -3 & -1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$AB = \begin{bmatrix} 8 & 5 \\ 20 & 13 \end{bmatrix}, BA = \begin{bmatrix} 13 & 20 \\ 5 & 8 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A+B = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 5 \\ 5 & 5 \end{bmatrix}, A-B = \begin{bmatrix} -3 & -1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$AB = \begin{bmatrix} 8 & 5 \\ 20 & 13 \end{bmatrix}, BA = \begin{bmatrix} 13 & 20 \\ 5 & 8 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A+B = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 5 \\ 5 & 5 \end{bmatrix}, A-B = \begin{bmatrix} -3 & -1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$AB = \begin{bmatrix} 8 & 5 \\ 20 & 13 \end{bmatrix}, BA = \begin{bmatrix} 13 & 20 \\ 5 & 8 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A+B = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 5 \\ 5 & 5 \end{bmatrix}, A-B = \begin{bmatrix} -3 & -1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$AB = \begin{bmatrix} 8 & 5 \\ 20 & 13 \end{bmatrix}, BA = \begin{bmatrix} 13 & 20 \\ 5 & 8 \end{bmatrix}$$

fixed point. We will complete the proof of our theorem by showing that this fixed point is unique, and that it is a continuous function of  $\gamma$ .

Suppose we have two invariant functions  $f$  and  $h$ . Then  $L_{f\gamma}f = W(f, \gamma)$ , and  $L_{h\gamma}h = W(h, \gamma)$ . Following Diliberto, we write

$$(20) \quad \|L_{f\gamma}f - L_{f\gamma}h\| \leq \|L_{h\gamma}h - L_{f\gamma}h\| + \|W(f, \gamma) - W(h, \gamma)\|.$$

Since

$$\|L_{f\gamma}^{-1}\| \leq A, \quad \left(\frac{1}{A}\right) \|f - h\| \leq \|L_{f\gamma}(f - h)\|.$$

$L_{h\gamma}h(\theta) - L_{f\gamma}h(\theta) = h(V_{h\gamma}(\theta)) - h(V_{f\gamma}(\theta))$ .  $h$  is an element of  $\bar{C}$ , therefore  $h$  is Lipschitzian with constant  $r_3$ , and  $\frac{dh}{d\theta_k}$  is Lipschitzian with constant  $u_1$ . Using this plus the big  $O$  properties of  $W$  and  $U$ ,

(v) we pick  $r_4 \leq r_3$ ,  $u_2 \leq u_1$ , and  $\gamma_5 \leq \gamma_4$ , so that the right hand side of (20) is less than or equal to  $\left(\frac{1}{2A}\right) \|f - h\|$ .

We now have that if  $L^{-1}W$  is restricted to the closure of  $C(r_4, u_2)$  and if  $|\gamma| \leq \gamma_5$ , the fixed points  $h$  and  $f$  satisfy the inequality

$$(21) \quad \left(\frac{1}{A}\right) \|f - h\| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2A}\right) \|f - h\|.$$

Therefore  $f = h$ .

If we let  $L_{f\gamma}f = W(f, \gamma)$ , and  $L_{h\gamma'}h = W(h, \gamma')$ , then using (20), it is easy to show that  $\|f - h\|$  tends to zero as  $|\gamma - \gamma'|$  tends to zero. This completes the proof of the theorem.

### Section 3

It was stated earlier that M. Marcus' result is included in the above theorem. Marcus assumed that  $\|N\|_0 < 1$ , and obtained an invariant function that is continuous and satisfies



a Lipschitz condition. In order to obtain invariant  $C^1$  functions whose derivatives satisfy a Lipschitz condition, we will make the slightly stronger assumption that  $\|N\| < 1$ .

If this is done,  $L_{f_Y}^{-1}$  exists and is uniformly bounded. This is established by taking  $\theta = G_{f_Y}(\bar{\theta})$ , the inverse of  $\bar{\theta} = V_{f_Y}(\bar{\theta})$ , and then picking  $r_0$  and  $\gamma_0$  so that for all  $h$ ,  $\|N(G_{f_Y})h(G_{f_Y})\| \leq q\|h\|$ .  $q$  is a constant such that  $\|N\| < q < 1$ .

#### Section 4

We now take  $s = 1$ . All functions considered will have period 1 in  $\theta$ . Let  $B$  be a constant matrix,  $Q(\theta)$  a non-singular periodic matrix, and let

$$(22) \quad N(\theta) = Q(\theta + \pi)BQ^{-1}(\theta), \quad \text{so} \quad N(\theta - \pi) = Q(\theta)BQ^{-1}(\theta - \pi).$$

We take  $L_{f_Y}$  as a transformation on the space of complex valued functions. If  $L_{f_Y}^{-1}$  exists and is uniformly bounded, it induces a transformation on the space of real functions that is also uniformly bounded. We must use the complex space since the eigenvalues of  $B$  play an important role.

Hufford showed that his  $N(\theta)$  had the above form. He assumed that if  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $B$ , then  $|\lambda| \neq 1$ . We will use the equation  $B = RJR^{-1}$ , where  $R$  is a constant matrix and  $J$  is the Jordan canonical form of  $B$ .

If  $N(\theta)$  has this special form, then  $L_{f_Y}^{-1}$  is uniformly bounded. To show this, we will find transformations acting independently on certain subspaces. Since none of the eigenvalues of  $B$  have absolute value equal to 1, these transformations will have inverses. This will imply that  $L_{f_Y}^{-1}$  exists and is uniformly bounded.

Let  $P(\theta) = Q(\theta)R$ . We define linear transformations  $\bar{P}$ ,  $\pi^{-1}$ ,  $\bar{V}_{f_Y}$  and  $\bar{J}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} [\bar{P}h](\theta) &= P(\theta)h(\theta) \\ [\pi^{-1}h](\theta) &= h(\theta - \pi) \\ [\bar{V}_{f_Y}h](\theta) &= h(V_{f_Y}(\theta)) \\ [\bar{J}h](\theta) &= Jh(\theta) \end{aligned}$$



Then

$$(24) \quad \pi^{-1}L_{f\gamma} = \pi^{-1}\bar{V}_{f\gamma} - \bar{P}\bar{J}\pi^{-1}\bar{P}^{-1} = \bar{P} [\bar{P}^{-1} \pi^{-1}\bar{V}_{f\gamma}\bar{P} - \pi^{-1}\bar{J}]\bar{P}^{-1}$$

Let

$$(25) \quad K_{f\gamma} = \bar{P}^{-1} \pi^{-1}\bar{V}_{f\gamma}\bar{P} - \bar{J}\pi^{-1}.$$

$$(26) \quad [K_{f\gamma}h](\theta) = P^{-1}(\theta)P(V_{f\gamma}(\theta - \pi))h(V_{f\gamma}(\theta - \pi)) - Jh(\theta - \pi).$$

$$(27) \quad V_{f\gamma}(\theta - \pi) = \theta + U(f(\theta - \pi), \theta - \pi, \gamma).$$

Because of this, if

$$(28) \quad P(V_{f\gamma}(\theta)) - P(\theta) = P_{f\gamma}(\theta),$$

then  $\|P_{f\gamma}\|$  can be made small by restricting  $\|f\|$  and  $|\gamma|$ .

$$(29) \quad [K_{f\gamma}h](\theta) = h(V_{f\gamma}(\theta - \pi)) - Jh(\theta - \pi) + P^{-1}(\theta)P_{f\gamma}(\theta)h(V_{f\gamma}(\theta - \pi)).$$

The first two terms define a linear transformation that acts independently on the subspaces determined by the canonical form of  $J$ . The third term can be made small in norm. A slight modification of the argument of Section 3 plus the proof used by Hufford in Lemma 3.1 of his thesis [1] shows that  $\pi^{-1}\bar{V}_{f\gamma} - \pi^{-1}\bar{J}$  has a uniformly bounded inverse. This implies that  $L_{f\gamma}^{-1}$  is uniformly bounded.



\*This report represents results obtained at the Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, under the auspices of Contract No. DA-30-069-ORD-1258 with the U. S. Army, Office of Ordnance Research. Reproduction in whole or in part permitted for any purpose by the United States Government.

#### References

- [1] HUFFORD, G., "Banack spaces and the perturbation of ordinary differential equations". Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton University, 1953.
- [2] MARCUS, M., "The application of fixed-point theorems to the perturbation of ordinary differential equations". Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, 1954.

The following are the names of the persons who have been  
 named in the report of the committee on the subject of the  
 investigation of the case of the late Mr. J. H. Smith, who  
 died on the 10th of March, 1881, at the age of 70 years.  
 The names are given in the order in which they were  
 mentioned in the report.

### MEMBERS

- (1) Mr. J. H. Smith, who was the subject of the investigation.
- (2) Mr. J. H. Smith, who was the subject of the investigation.
- (3) Mr. J. H. Smith, who was the subject of the investigation.
- (4) Mr. J. H. Smith, who was the subject of the investigation.
- (5) Mr. J. H. Smith, who was the subject of the investigation.
- (6) Mr. J. H. Smith, who was the subject of the investigation.
- (7) Mr. J. H. Smith, who was the subject of the investigation.
- (8) Mr. J. H. Smith, who was the subject of the investigation.
- (9) Mr. J. H. Smith, who was the subject of the investigation.
- (10) Mr. J. H. Smith, who was the subject of the investigation.

Office of Ordnance Research  
Distribution List  
for  
Technical Reports

|                                                                                                                              |      |                                                                                                                                                                                             |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Commanding Officer<br>Office of Ordnance Research<br>Box CM, Duke Station<br>Durham, North Carolina                          | (10) | Commanding Officer<br>Watertown Arsenal<br>Watertown 72, Mass<br>Attn: W. A. Laboratories                                                                                                   | (1) |
| Chief of Ordnance<br>Department of the Army<br>Washington 25, D. C.<br>Attn: ORDTB-PS                                        | (2)  | Commanding General<br>White Sands Proving Ground<br>Las Cruces, New Mexico<br>Attn: ORDBS-TS-TIB                                                                                            | (1) |
| Deputy Chief of Staff<br>for Logistics<br>Department of the Army<br>Washington 25, D. C.<br>Attn: Research Br., R and D Div. | (1)  | Commanding Officer<br>Diamond Ordnance Fuze Labs<br>Washington 25, D. C.                                                                                                                    | (1) |
| Commanding General<br>Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland<br>Attn: BRL                                                         | (2)  | Commanding General<br>Ordnance Weapons Command<br>Rock Island, Illinois<br>Attn: Research Branch                                                                                            | (2) |
| Commanding General<br>Frankford Arsenal<br>Bridesburg Station<br>Philadelphia 37, Penna<br>Attn: CRDBA-LC                    | (1)  | Chief, New York Ordnance District<br>180 Varick Street<br>New York 14, N. Y.                                                                                                                | (2) |
| Commanding General<br>Picatinny Arsenal<br>Dover, New Jersey<br>Attn: S. Feltman Ammo Lab                                    | (2)  | Chief of Ordnance<br>Department of the Army<br>Washington 25, D. C.<br>Attn: ORDGU-SE<br>For Transmittal to:<br>Canadian Joint Staff<br>2001 Connecticut Ave., N.W.<br>Washington 25, D. C. | (1) |
| Commanding General<br>Redstone Arsenal<br>Huntsville, Alabama<br>Attn: CRDDW-MR                                              | (1)  | Office of Naval Research<br>Washington 25, D. C.<br>Attn: Math.                                                                                                                             | (1) |
| Commanding General<br>Rock Island Arsenal<br>Rock Island, Illinois                                                           | (1)  | The Director<br>Naval Research Laboratory<br>Washington 25, D. C.<br>Attn: Code 2021                                                                                                        | (1) |
| Commanding Officer<br>Springfield Armory<br>Springfield 1, Mass                                                              | (1)  | Commanding Officer<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Branch Office<br>Navy, 100, FPO<br>New York, New York                                                                                     | (2) |
| Commanding Officer<br>Watervliet Arsenal<br>Watervliet, New York                                                             | (1)  | Commander<br>U.S. Naval Proving Ground<br>Dahlgren, Virginia                                                                                                                                | (1) |
| Commanding Officer<br>Watertown Arsenal<br>Watertown 72, Mass<br>Attn: OMRO                                                  | (1)  |                                                                                                                                                                                             |     |



# Distribution List (Cont.)

|                                                                                                                                                                            |     |                                                                                                                                          |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| U. S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory<br>White Oak, Silver Spring 19,<br>Maryland<br>Attn: Library Division                                                                      | (1) | Armed Services Tech. Info. Agency<br>Document Service Center<br>Knott Building<br>4th and Main Streets<br>Dayton 2, Ohio                 | (5) |
| Commanding Officer<br>U. S. Naval Powder Factory<br>Indian Head, Maryland                                                                                                  | (1) | U.S. Atomic Energy Commission<br>Document Library<br>19th and Constitution Ave., N.W.<br>Washington 25, D. C.                            | (1) |
| Chief, Bureau of Ordnance (AD3)<br>Department of the Navy<br>Washington 25, D. C.                                                                                          | (1) | Director, Applied Physics Lab<br>Johns Hopkins University<br>8621 Georgia Avenue<br>Silver Spring 19, Maryland<br>Attn: Dr. R. C. Herman | (1) |
| Director<br>Air University Library<br>Maxwell Air Force Base<br>Alabama                                                                                                    | (1) | Technical Information Service<br>P.O. Box 62<br>Oak Ridge, Tennessee<br>Attn: Reference Branch                                           | (1) |
| Commander<br>Wright Air Development Center<br>Wright-Patterson Air Force Base<br>Ohio<br>Attn: WCRRO                                                                       | (1) | Director<br>National Bureau of Standards<br>Washington 25, D. C.<br>Attn: Applied Math. Div.                                             | (1) |
| Commanding General<br>Air Res. and Dev. Command<br>P.O. Box 1395<br>Baltimore 3, Maryland<br>Attn: RDR                                                                     | (1) | Corona Laboratories<br>National Bureau of Standards<br>Corona, California                                                                | (1) |
| Commanding General<br>Air Res. and Dev. Command<br>P.O. Box 1395<br>Baltimore 3, Maryland<br>Attn: RDTOIL (Tech Library)                                                   | (1) | Jet Propulsion Laboratory<br>California Institute of Tech.<br>4800 Oak Grove Drive<br>Pasadena 3, California<br>Attn: A. J. Stosick      | (1) |
| Technical Reports Library<br>SCEL, Evans Signal Corps Lab<br>Belmar, New Jersey                                                                                            | (1) | Commanding General<br>ABMA<br>Redstone Arsenal<br>Huntsville, Alabama                                                                    | (1) |
| Commanding General<br>Signal Corps Engineering Lab<br>Forth Monmouth, New Jersey<br>Attn: Director of Research                                                             | (1) |                                                                                                                                          |     |
| Office of the Chief Signal Officer<br>Engineering and Technical Div.<br>Engineering Control Branch<br>Room 2B273, Pentagon Building<br>Washington 25, D. C.<br>Attn: SIGGD | (1) |                                                                                                                                          |     |
| Commanding Officer<br>Engineering Res. and Dev. Labs<br>Fort Belvoir, Virginia                                                                                             | (1) |                                                                                                                                          |     |





